

Rec'd PCT/PTO 27 SEP 2006
PATENT COOPERATION TREATY
PCT 10/553548

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PHGB030050	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/IB2004/001210	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 15 April 2004 (15.04.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 24 April 2003 (24.04.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.		

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 *bis*.1(a).
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I | Basis of the report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Date of issuance of this report 20 June 2006 (20.06.2006)
	Authorized officer Cecile Chatel Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 60

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 02 MAR 2006

WIPO

PCT

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/B2004/001210

International filing date (day/month/year)
15.04.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
24.04.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F9/46

Applicant
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the International application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Michel, T

Telephone No. +31 70 340-3829



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/001210

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/001210

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	3 5-8 11 13-15
	No: Claims	1 2 4 9 10 12
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-15
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-15
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

TEST AVAILABLE COPY

Re Item V.

1. D1: US 2002/087649 A1 (HORVITZ ERIC J) 4 July 2002 (2002-07-04)

2. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 and 9

2. 1 Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses (the references in parenthesis applying to this document) a method of handling alerts of an event (methodology for reducing the disruption costs associated with notifying of message and/or alerts; paragraph 8), the event comprising delivery of data (messages; paragraph 8, email, financial update, instant message; paragraph 332) to a user device (messages directed towards users; paragraph 8), comprising:

receiving an event notification (notification agent 28 receives notifications from the sources; paragraph 53),
acquiring information relating to the users likely current activity (context information relating to the user; paragraph 9 and user's likely available time, paragraph 106),
acquiring filtering information (deferral policies; Fig 6),
comparing (in accordance; paragraph 53) the users likely current activity with the filtering information and outputting an alert to the user (directs the notification to one or more clients; paragraph 53) dependent upon the comparison of the users likely current activity with the filtering information (in accordance with the bounded deferral policies; paragraph 53).

Therefore the subject-matter of claim 1, known from D1, does not meet the requirements of novelty of Art. 33(1) and (2) PCT.

2.2 A corresponding objection of novelty applies mutatis mutandis to corresponding independent system claim 9.

3. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-8, 10-15

D1 further discloses the step of classifying the event notification as being of a predetermined type (notification of different types; paragraph 287). Therefore the subject-matter of claim 2 is not new (Article 33(1) and (2) PCT).

D1 further discloses that notifications are assigned priority values (low/normal priority; paragraphs 73 and 81). Therefore the subject-matter of claim 3 is not inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

D1 further discloses the step of acquiring information relating to the users likely current activity comprises accessing information on the current state of one or more user devices (device activity; paragraph 89). Therefore the subject-matter of claim 4 is not new (Article 33(1) and (2) PCT).

D1 further discloses the step of deferring notifications (deferral; paragraphs 69-71 and notification relayed when free state is reached; paragraph 95). Therefore the subject-matter of claim 7 is not inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

D1 further discloses the step of outputting the stored alert if the users likely current activity has changed (messages are reported when the users returns to interact; paragraph 267). Therefore the subject-matter of claim 8 is not inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

Dependent claims 5-6 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in terms of inventive step (Art 33(3) PCT) in view of the prior art.

The subject-matter of corresponding system claims 10-15 cannot therefore considered as being inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).

Thierry Michel